

Appln No. 09/975,532
Amdt date June 5, 2006
Reply to Office action of April 12, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-44 are pending. No claim has been amended.

A Notice of Allowance was mailed on 5/16/05 allowing all the previously pending claims (claims 1-41). The issue fee was paid on 8/16/05. Subsequently, a Notice of Withdrawal From Issue Under 37 CFR 1.313(b) was mailed on 11/30/05. The current Final Office action is in response to the Notice of Withdrawal From Issue.

Claims 1, 13, 25, 32, 38, 40-42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kara (U.S.6,505,179 B1). However, the Office action fails to show how Kara reference is equally applicable to claims 1, 13, 25, 32, 38, 40 and 41 with regard to their different limitations.

MPEP 707.07(d) states that "[a] plurality of claims should never be grouped together in a common rejection, unless that rejection is equally applicable to all claims in the group."

For example, there is nothing in the Office action about how Kara teaches "the indicium including an indicator verifying a match with the pre-printed serial number," with respect to claim 1, "the indicium providing a visual verification of a match with the pre-printed serial number," with respect to claim 13, "tracking the use of the pre-printed serial number," with respect to claim 32, "the label stock cut with a special die and including printing in color-changing ink" and "the indicium providing means for verifying the validity of the postage by a known correspondence to the pre-printed serial number," with respect to claim 38, or "generating a label stock display using the label stock type and label starting sequence number, the label stock display providing means for verifying the validity of the postage in relation to the label starting sequence number," with respect to claim 41. Rather, the Office action groups together claims 1, 13, 25, 32, 38, 40 and 41 each having a different limitation, in a common rejection over Kara.

Nevertheless, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are patently distinguishable over the cited references and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application.

Appln No. 09/975,532
Amdt date June 5, 2006
Reply to Office action of April 12, 2006

Kara teaches a fundamentally different system than the claimed invention. In the system of Kara, an original display media (e.g., a ticket) includes an indicia portion 16a and a human readable portion 16b (FIG. 1 and col. 3, lines 56-64). A user then "either verbally or via scanner 34 (which can be part of printer 36 if desired) reads off the human readable portion of code 16b shown in FIG. 1," and communicates it to a seller's system 40. (Col. 4, lines 39-44.). This code 16b received by the seller system 40 "determines whether the code that has just been received from the preprinted form is a valid code," for example, if the pre-printed code is within an acceptable range. (Col. 4, lines 45-51, underlining is added.).

If the pre-printed code is valid, the seller's system 40 then uses a code, or a portion thereof, as a key and generates a second indicia and sends the second indicia to the user for printing. The second indicia is used "to verify the authenticity of the ticket when the user arrives at the terminal for boarding the airplane." (Col. 5, lines 57-64, underlining is added.).

In other words, the system of Kara communicates the pre-printed code 16b to a seller's system so that the received code 16b will be used to determine whether the code is a valid code, for example, if the pre-printed code is within an acceptable range. The seller's system then generates a second indicia to be printed and used for validation of the ticket.

Independent **claim 1** includes, among other limitations, "generating an indicium in accordance with the master serial number, pre-printed serial number, and the postage request, the indicium including an indicator verifying a match with the pre-printed serial number." Kara does not teach or suggest the above limitation. First, Kara does not generate an indicium (to be printed) in accordance with the master serial number and the pre-printed serial number. Rather, as discussed above, Kara generates a second indicia based on a coding algorithm utilizing a particular key contained in the received indicia portion 16a. The second indicia is then printed on a ticket. (Col. 4, lines 52-64). There is no relation between the second indicia of Kara and the pre-printed serial number.

Second, Kara's printed second indicium does not include "an indicator verifying a match with the pre-printed serial number." Rather, Kara's printed second indicium includes encrypted information based on a particular key contained in the received indicia portion 16a and does not

Appln No. 09/975,532
Amdt date June 5, 2006
Reply to Office action of April 12, 2006

include any information about the pre-printed serial number (code 16b). **Third**, there is no verification of a match with the pre-printed serial number in Kara's indicium. Accordingly, claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Kara.

Independent **claim 13** includes, among other limitations, "generating an indicium in accordance with the master serial number, pre-printed serial number, and the postage request, the indicium providing a visual verification of a match with the pre-printed serial number." As discussed above, Kara does not teach or suggest the above limitation. **Additionally**, Kara does not teach or suggest "a visual verification of a match with the pre-printed serial number." As a result, claim 13 is not taught or suggested by Kara.

Independent **claim 32** includes, among other limitations, "generating an indicium in accordance with the pre-printed serial number and the postage request," and "tracking the use of the pre-printed serial number."

First, as described above with respect to claims 1 and 13, Kara does not teach or suggest "generating an indicium in accordance with the pre-printed serial number." **Second**, Kara does not teach or suggest "tracking the use of the pre-printed serial number." Even assuming that the human readable code portion 16b of Kara can be construed as a label serial number, the Examiner has not pointed to any section in Kara that describes tracking the use of the pre-printed portion 16b. Consequently, claim 32 is not taught or suggested by Kara.

Independent **claim 38** includes, among other limitations, "the label stock cut with a special die and including printing in color-changing ink," and "generating an indicium in accordance with the pre-printed serial number and the postage request, the indicium providing means for verifying the validity of the postage by a known correspondence to the pre-printed serial number." As discussed above, Kara does not teach or suggest "generating an indicium in accordance with the pre-printed serial number and the postage request, the indicium providing means for verifying the validity of the postage by a known correspondence to the pre-printed serial number." **Additionally**, Kara does not teach or suggest "the label stock cut with a special die and including printing in color-changing ink." Accordingly, claim 38 is not taught or suggested by Kara.

Appln No. 09/975,532
Amdt date June 5, 2006
Reply to Office action of April 12, 2006

Independent claim 40 includes, among other limitations, "generating an indicium in accordance with the pre-printed serial number and the postage request," and "tracking the use of the pre-printed serial number." as described above with respect to claims 1, 13 and 32, Kara does not teach or suggest the above limitations. As a result, claim 40 is not taught or suggested by Kara.

Independent claim 41 includes, among other limitations, "receiving a label starting sequence number for a label from the plurality of sequenced labels," and "generating a label stock display using the label stock type and label starting sequence number, the label stock display providing means for verifying the validity of the postage in relation to the label starting sequence number." There is no mention in Kara of "receiving a label starting sequence number for a label from the plurality of sequenced labels."


Furthermore, Kara does not teach or suggest "generating a label stock display using the label stock type and label starting sequence number, the label stock display providing means for verifying the validity of the postage in relation to the label starting sequence number." Rather, it is the second indicia in Kara that is used to verify the ticket. This second indicia is not the same as "a label stock display using the label stock type and label starting sequence number." In addition Kara's system does not verify "the validity of the postage in relation to the label starting sequence number." Rather, it verifies the validity of the ticket based on decrypting encrypted information based on a particular key contained in the received indicia portion 16a. (Id.). Consequently, claim 41 is not taught or suggested by Kara.

In short, independent claims 1, 13, 25, 32, 38, 40 and 41 define a novel and non-obvious invention over the cited references. Dependent claims 2-12, 14-24, 26-31, 33-37, 39 and 42-44 are dependent from claims 1, 13, 25, 32, 38, and 41, respectively and therefore include all the limitations of their respective base claims and additional limitations therein. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable over the cited references, as being dependent from allowable independent claims, and for the additional limitations they include therein.

Appln No. 09/975,532
Amdt date June 5, 2006
Reply to Office action of April 12, 2006

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Raymond R. Tabandeh
Reg. No. 43,945
626/795-9900

RRT/clv

CLV PAS684054.1.*-06/06 3:21 PM